



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

In this corner of the Journal I am always frankly personal and I might head *Brief Mention* as a French man of letters headed a book of his, *Mon franc parler*. It is not always an *angulus ridens*, a 'riant nook', to use the affected language of a once famous pulpit orator; and the losses that I have sustained personally and professionally in the last few months have made even the semblance of cheerfulness difficult. The daily press keeps us Americans informed as to the passing of the great lights of English scholarship, and the shock of Jebb's death was transmitted to this side on the same day it befell; but it has happened over and over again that I have missed the brief necrologies of German journals and have found out only long afterwards, sometimes by the cruel medium of a book sale, that some one in whom I took a special interest had ceased from his labours. Such was the case with Wachsmuth, the son-in-law of Ritschl, who by reason of my cult of the great master, (A. J. P. V 339 foll.), had taken me into the life of his family in 1880. Such was the case with Kaibel, of whose work I had more than once expressed my great admiration (A. J. P. XVII 127; XVIII 353; XX 108). But all my 'weather-beaten hardihood of soul' was not proof against the news of USENER's death, which did not reach me until I read the tribute paid to him by his illustrious friend and colleague, BUECHELER, in the *Neue Jahrbücher*. I knew that he had been ill, but I understood from one of his connexions in Göttingen last summer that he had rallied and the end, it seems, came suddenly after all. The state of his eyes had long rendered personal correspondence impossible, but I had hailed with pleasure every few weeks the familiar initials on the wrapper of the *Rheinisches Museum*, or on some special brochure, for he wrote unremittingly to the last. In 1904 his friends and pupils celebrated his jubilee and as a *Nachfeier* there appeared last summer a special number of the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, dedicated to him as the founder and upholder of that admirable repertory. No opportunity was given me of joining the throng that hailed the completion of his fifty years in the doctorate, and more pressing matter crowded out a notice of the *Archiv* tribute. If I were an astrologer, I might account for the fascination that both the man and his writings have had for me, from the beginning of our acquaintance in 1880, by the fact that we were born on the same day of the month, though some years apart; but no such explanation is needed by any one who has enjoyed his hospitality or has followed the range of his studies. 'Ein

Junge, geboren im Monat Oktober, wird ein Kritiker und das ein recht grober' is a distich that comes up to my mind from Pückler-Muskau's 'Briefe eines Verstorbenen'. But there was no such astral influence that dominated his bearing towards me. Criticism there was, but it was as mellow as the October sun. The side of his manifold activity, by which he is perhaps best known, is one that had interested me years ago, as may be gathered from my paper on *The Legend of Venus in Essays and Studies*, a very inadequate performance as judged by the light of recent research; and it was a special pleasure to me when I had an opportunity of summarizing a book of his, as I have done for the Journal more than once, *Epicurea* (A. J. P. IX 229), *Götternamen* (A. J. P. XVII 356-366), *Sintfluthsagen* (A. J. P. XX 210-215); not to speak of minor notices. I cannot undertake to characterize the work of his life here. I have never named him but to praise, and now he is beyond my praise in every sense.

I remember well when Lachmann's Lucretius came out. There was great excitement in the philological world and as the old grammarian wrote of Persius: editum librum mirari et diripere homines coeperunt. But there was disappointment as well as excitement and I recall how a favorite teacher of mine cut the leaves of the Lucretius with feverish haste to find what Lachmann had said of one of his pet emendations. He found it and his face fell. But perhaps he would have been more chafallen had there been no mention of him. *περὶ ἐμοῦ δ' οὐδεὶς λόγος* is the unuttered cry of many a fardel-bearing Xanthias, and no one can understand the plural *silentia* better than a neglected commentator, unless it be a pilfered grammarian. But a long career has made me silence-proof, though I must confess to a queer sentimentality, when the Harpers proposed some years ago to break up the plates of my Persius as an utterly unavailable asset. It was a forerunner of the doom that overtakes us all. So it may be imagined that I was not in the least surprised to find that RAMORINO has taken no notice of my *Persius* in his *Persio* (Turin, Loescher), though recent editions are few, and the present generation of Italian scholars are nothing, if not exhaustive in the matter of 'literature', (A. J. P. XXIV 108). Besides, my Persius was a bookseller's job—honestly done, it is true, but without much heart in it, and the chief pleasure I had in the work was in the study of the congeneric literature, seeking if haply I might find something that had escaped the vision of such scholars as Casaubon and Jahn. The proportion is about the proportion of gold in sea-water. And yet I took RAMORINO with me on my travels last summer, intending to see whether he had lost anything by not consulting my work. Unfortunately or fortunately, RAMORINO's style is unbearably diffuse, his new MS seemed to me rather infructuous, and besides he

is a Neronian, so that I was hopelessly prejudiced from the start, and soon lost patience over the quest. Of course, something is to be got out of RAMORINO, and I will not repeat the contemptuous German formula 'Nichts zu holen'. The medley called satire is readily illustrated from the medley we call life, and everybody can contribute something. Only the other day I found in a newspaper correspondence the following sentence, 'Teachers do turn pale inwardly if not outwardly'. It is safe to say that the woman who wrote those words was not alluding to Pers. 3, 42: *intus palleat*, which has bothered some commentators. After I had turned my back on Persius, the alembicated heathen, and attacked Justin Martyr, the slovenly Christian, I began in the interest of my edition to read Clement of Alexandria, and other patristic writers, and, while reading, found a number of illustrations for Persius, that had been overlooked or rejected by previous editors; and not so long ago I stumbled on yet another in Lykophron (A. J. P. XXII 345), so that if I were re-editing Persius, which God forbid, I should not neglect RAMORINO, as he has neglected me, but I must frankly say, that so far as I have examined him, I do not think that he has earned the right to criticize Némethy as he has done, for like Némethy, his 'note' are 'copiose, ma non prive di errori.' Indeed, nothing could be worse in Némethy than RAMORINO's note on 1, 52: *lectis citreis* which he translates 'sofà di legno di cedro', a blunder that reminds one of Lessing's caustic remarks on the blockhead who mistranslated Horace's *trabe Cypria*. On 1, 66 he follows his own MS in reading *dirigat* for *derigat*, and takes no notice of the difference between the two words. 1, 73, the long note on Remus might have been shortened to explain the popularity of Romulus's double, (Mommsen, Hermes, XVI 1, A. J. P. III 107); or else the utterly useless note on the 'bel quadretto' of the wife of Cincinnatus, omitted. 1, 114: *secuit urbem*, he understands *secuit* of an anatomical section, 'quasi fece una sezione anatomica della sua città per mostrarne i difetti'—to me an extraordinary interpretation. But time fails me to make an anatomical section of RAMORINO.

The chief interest in the Septuagint must always lie in its relation to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament; but there are subordinate problems enough to challenge the attention of the Greek scholar proper, although the introduction of CONYBEARE and STORK'S *Selections from the Septuagint* into a *College Series of Greek Authors* (Ginn & Co.) seems to have been prompted mainly by international comity. It is hardly more apposite than the appearance of SCHODORF'S treatise on Greek juridical terms in SCHANZ'S contributions to Greek historical syntax. At all events the editors find it necessary to justify their presence in

such company and at the close of their discussion of the language of the LXX they remark :

The result of these various causes is often such as to cause disgust to the classical student. Indeed a learned Jesuit Father has confessed to us what a shock he received on first making acquaintance with the Greek of the Septuagint. But the fastidiousness of the classical scholar must not be nourished at the expense of narrowing the bounds of thought. The Greek language did not die with Plato; it is not dead yet; like the Roman Empire, it is interesting in all stages of its growth and decline. One important stage of its life-history is the ecclesiastical Greek which followed the introduction of Christianity. This could never have been but for the New Testament. But neither could the New Testament itself have been but for the Septuagint.

But if I were pleading the cause of Septuagint Greek, I should go farther than that. There are important lessons to be learned from the decay of a language even for its earlier estate, even for the days of its classical perfection. 'Language', as I have said elsewhere, (A. J. P. XXIII 258) 'remains organic. The laws of the death are the laws of the life. Deorganization is unravelling, and the unweaving teaches us the weaving'. Why, even the rag carpet enables us to reproduce the product of the fairy loom. And as for disgust, every scholar knows that those who are most shocked by later Greek are apt to be those who know precious little of the language at its best. Fastidious exactness is not incompatible with historical vision. The student of language must not pray for an imperforate nose like the slave in the Peace. Smell and vision help one another. At any rate one says with fine old Sophokles of Harvard, *συνεκποτέα καὶ τὴν τρύγα*.

Now 'as the life of a language' according to CONYBEARE and STORK 'lies rather in the syntax than in the vocabulary' and 'as the modes of thought of the Septuagint are purely Hebraic', it is necessary to penetrate into the recesses of classical syntax in order to appreciate the full extent of the divergence. The rough facts every one knows. No one expects style of the Septuagint. In fact, it is the absurd literalness of the Septuagint that constitutes its great value. But after all, there are limits to literalness and there are curious concessions to Greek idiom. It is not enough to say that the noteworthy absence of the participle is explained by the paratactic character of the Hebrew narrative. That is a point that has been amply illustrated in this Journal (IX 153 foll.). But one asks: Why does it persist where it persists? The Hebrew does not suggest *ἀναστάντες κατὰβητε* (Gen. XLIII 13) any more than it suggests *κύψαντες προσεκύνησαν* (v. 28) *ἀναβλέψας ἶδεν* (v. 29) *νιψάμενος τὸ πρόσωπον ἐξελθὼν ἐνεκρατεύσατο* (v. 31)—to take only one chapter. And the first example is highly idiomatic. The absence of the *μέν* and *δέ* group is a familiar characteristic of this

sphere and makes it impossible to repress a smile, when unqualified persons claim classical perfection for the Epistle of St. James (A. J. P. XVI 526), but the Greeks themselves vary much in their use of μέν and δέ, though Benn went absurdly far when he maintained that the predominance of the antithetic structure of Greek is due to Pythagorean influence. It is of the essence of Greekdom. οἷδ' ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ, οἷδ' ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ νωμῆσαι βῶν. Then there is the use of τοῦ with the infinitive of purpose. It has after all only a limited scope in classical Greek, and it is amusing to remember that when Schanz started his 'Beiträge' he announced his intention to write a treatise about it (A. J. P. IV 419). The book would not have had many pages. But when CONYBEARE and STORK say that there is nothing in the Hebrew to suggest it, I am not so thoroughly convinced. Hebrew ordinarily represents the genitive relation by the construct case, an instructive reversal of the Greek process, but the genitive itself is usually represented by ה, as in I. Sam. XIV 16, where הַיָּנֹכַח = τοῦ Σαούλ (LXX) and the Hebrew infinitive with the prefix ה would at once suggest a rendering by the Greek genitive of the articular infinitive, which is treated by the Septuagint people with the same freedom as we treat our pseudo-infinitive with *to*. And not unrelated to this group is the free employment in the Septuagint of prepositions with the articular infinitive for the rendering of Hebrew idioms. Nothing, in fact shows more distinctly the vulgarity of the Greek on which the Septuagint drew than this whole sphere of usage. The learned Jesuit, who, if he had lived in the time of Julian, would doubtless have shared the Emperor's contempt for Matthew and Luke, might not condescend to details of statistical syntax; might, in fact, be too busy holding his aesthetic nose to notice the consistence of the offensive mess, and yet it seems to me that a scholar, alive to Greek usage, would have been struck with the abnormal frequency of the aorist imperative in the LXX. In the orators, f. i. present and aorist nearly balance. In LXX Greek the aorist is monotonously predominant. This is explicable enough in the Psalms, (see my Justin Martyr, Apol. I 16, 6), but the predominance elsewhere is a significant fact which calls for some explanation or, at all events, some animadversion (see A. J. P. XXIV 482). There are other points that I have noticed, as for instance, the large use of οὐ μὴ in this sphere of Greek (XVIII 460) and one of my contributors undertook some time ago to explain ὅς ἐστιν (A. J. P. XXIV 447), but while Mr. CONYBEARE has not disdained to use the Journal as a medium of publication for his own researches, he has evidently not paid it the compliment of reading the contributions that have been made by it to the very subject in which he professes an especial interest and claims especial achievements.

Egypt continues to yield document after document for the illumination of the life of Mizraim under the Ptolemies, under

the Romans, all of them exceeding precious to the Egyptologist, though the vast majority lack human interest. And this is true of the *Papyrus Th. Reinach* (Paris, Leroux), a large part of which is given up to loans of wheat with only an occasional receipt. But one cannot make the same complaint of the absence of wine as was made in regard to the absence of beer in the first volume of the *Tebtunis Papyri* (A. J. P. XXIV, 110); and one of the most interesting numbers is an order for wine in which the customer bids the furnisher follow his nose in making the selection, but distinctly states that if there is any bad wine in the lot he will throw the whole thing on the contractor's hands. And highly vinous is a bit of titubant, Bacchanal poetry which will recall to every one the famous Grenfell Erotic Fragment, both by its metre and by its theme, for love figures here also, though it is a mere κῶμος love. 'We have here' as M. REINACH says, 'the same abrupt, passionate, asyndetic style, the same realism, with the same preciousity, (*réalisme précieux*), the same mixture of poetic expressions and of vulgarisms borrowed from the language of everyday conversation, and the same Ionisms, which betray the source of all this literature'. The run of the metre is paeonian, but M. REINACH discourages the restoration on dochmiac lines, nay, he will not even decide that it is either prose or poetry. 'En grec il n'est pas vrai de dire avec Molière: Tout ce qui n'est point prose est vers et tout ce qui n'est point vers est prose'—and he quotes Dionysius to his purpose, *De Comp.* cc. 25, 26.

Professor ALCIDE MACÉ, of Rennes, well known as a special student of Latin pronunciation, has given circulation to an address delivered by him before the International Congress of Historical Sciences, Rome, 1903, in which he urged the adoption of a uniform pronunciation of Latin, not the pronunciation of the late Republic or of the early Empire, with clear discrimination as to quantity and due regard to pitch accent. No! We must go back, not to Cicero, but to Constantine, pronounce the vowels as they are pronounced in Italian, give C, G and T, before E and I the same sound as before A, hold on to the sledge-hammer stress accent, and let the quantity go to the place in which quantity has a decided advantage over quality. The strict observance of quantity, he maintains, is practically nothing but a *pium desiderium*. 'Aliud esse scis', writes Buecheler to MACÉ, 'uelle ac posse, aliud praecipere ac perficere', for despite the pains the teachers take, there seems to be great carelessness in Germany still, as there was in my time fifty years ago. Of course, such an agreement as M. MACÉ advocates, would help forward the cause of international communication. The professional scholar might be as accurate as he pleased in his pronunciation, as beautifully accurate as Buecheler himself, but

the average man of letters and science could make himself understood all over Europe, and that is the main thing, for Latin could then be restored to its old function of a universal language. Years ago when I was struggling with the difficulties of French pronunciation a cynical Frenchman said to me, 'Why don't you and your countrymen go to Chambéry and learn to speak Savoyard French? To be sure, it is not French of the right sort, but you can never learn the real French pronunciation, and the Savoyard pronunciation anybody can learn. And then every Frenchman will understand you, which is more than can be said now'. M. MACÉ reminds me of my cynical friend. The proposition is a sad one as coming from a student of the ancient pronunciation, but 'le mieux est l'ennemi du bien', and the return to Latin seems to be more and more a necessity for the scholarly world.

Raphael Kühner tells us that in order to fit himself for writing elementary books on Greek and Latin grammar, he emptied himself of his glory as the Rector of the Lyceum at Hanover, and taught the lower classes in the school. Now I do not know whether Professor HALE was inspired by the example of Raphael Kühner or not. Indeed I have often found to my surprise that the works as well as the ways of Raphael Kühner are not so familiar even to eminent Greek scholars as they might be, and in the last few years I have noticed more than one discovery that were not discoveries to those who had waded through the *Ausführliche Grammatik* (A. J. P. XII 70, XVII 516). But whether inspired by Kühner's example or not, Professor HALE has in like manner come down from his Headship in the University of Chicago, and in order to put the practical value of his syntactical theories to the test has taught elementary classes in Latin with the satisfactory results which he has set forth in the first number of the new *Classical Journal*. Now I do not wish to discourage such experiments, and have great hesitation about intruding into such illustrious company, but I feel it my duty to say that my own experience has made me very skeptical as to the value of such tests. It has been my fortune to conduct classes in elementary Greek—not from choice, Heaven forbid—but from sheer necessity, and it always seemed to me that I acquitted myself there better than anywhere else; and yet I am popularly supposed to be a thing made up of impracticalities. At least a scholar whom I hold in high esteem told the world some years ago that he could not avail himself of my grammatical work on account of the elementary character of his own manual. 'For young students' he says, 'a simple, clear, and brief statement is essential', from which I draw the unflattering, but inevitable inference that my presentation of Greek syntax is 'complicated', 'obscure' and 'prolix'. Now

I do not undertake to defend myself against these charges, at least in this place; but the fact abides that as a teacher I have always made my nostrums go down and have had abundant evidence that once down they did their office, whereas so many grammatical rules simply come up undamaged by the digestive process of their recipients. However, any enthusiastic teacher, any theorist enamored of his own tenets, can tell of the same experience; and I have no doubt that Rector Raphael Kühner found the boys very ready to take in the optative for the subjunctive of the historical tenses and the interrogative nature of the negative $\mu\eta$ in sentences of fear, and all the other things that even the piety of his editors has not enabled them to swallow. So perhaps Professor HALE's experiments with what I have ventured to call his spectrum gratings of the Latin subjunctive may not be so conclusive as he fancies. Just think with what docility the boys of the past generation took in 'absolute' and 'relative' time, as nonsensical a notion, I venture to say, as was ever foisted on a credulous grammatical public. Some years went by and the relative and absolute flag was hauled down by those who had flown it most resolutely before the world; and those of us who were deemed behind the times because we refused to accept the terminology, were justified of our reserve and by no one more effectively than by Professor HALE himself. Of Professor HALE's methods in Latin I have no criticism to make, however we may differ in our interpretation of the phenomena of Greek. All that I venture to suggest is that the acceptance of a teacher's methods in the practice of the school is not quite so conclusive an argument for their didactic value as Professor HALE seems to think.

The bare title, *Kultur der Gegenwart* (Teubner), recalls the golden days when everybody believed in the mission of the classical literatures and languages, to which one of the volumes of this new Cyclopaedia is consecrated. Like the *Companion to Greek Studies*, edited by Mr. WHIBLEY, it is a wholesome reminder that there is something besides grammar. Grammar is needful. It is the iron in the ferro-concrete mass, but it is not the whole building. In the German work, *Greek Literature* is handled by WILAMOWITZ, *Roman Literature* by LEO, two masters, rarely equipped for the task; in the English work, *Greek Literature* has fallen to the peerless JEBB: and it would be interesting to note the differences between WILAMOWITZ and JEBB; for the comparative study of literature extends to the varying national conceptions of foreign literatures as well. But as I write, the death of the veteran, WILHELM VON CHRIST reminds me that I have thus far failed to notice the appearance of the fourth edition of his *Griechische Literaturgeschichte* with considerable

additions to the iconography by FURTWÄNGLER and SIEVEKING (Munich, Beck). Those who remember the days when there was practically nothing but Nicolai for the post-classical time, will be grateful to the unwearied scholar, whose individual contributions to a wide range of Greek studies entitled him to draw on the resources of others. For no history of Greek literature can be autoptical throughout. To read reflectively all the Greek that can be called literature from Homer, say, even to Nonnos, does not seem feasible. And if it were feasible, the cloistered soul who should accomplish it, would not be fit to deal with literature, which is not to be divorced from life. Even classical Greek literature is a severe strain. A gallant spirit, like Mr. Gilbert Murray, may take up classical Greek literature as a very little thing; and doubtless one can scamper through it after a fashion in a few months, but to form a personal estimate of every author even of the classical period, an estimate reposing on close study is another matter. Impressions have a certain interest. Epigrams may serve to amuse. But what does the specialist care for the judgment of these nimble wits? Read the originals, of course, rather than the commentators. But it is impossible to characterize an author aright without attacking the problems of genesis, the problems of genuineness. Homer alone is the study of a lifetime. The vision of Plato shifts according to the order, according to the range of the canon. Euripides suggests a long list of questions, and we cannot escape a library of treatises from A. W. Schlegel to Wilamowitz. One must read DECHARME, whose *Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre* has recently been translated into English by Mr. LOEB for those who are so unfortunate as not to read French (Macmillan). NESTLE is not negligible (A. J. P. XXIII 111); and who would not surrender for a while to the charm of the ingenious Dr. VERRALL, who has just added *Four Plays of Euripides* (Cambridge University Press), to his other remarkable Euripidean studies? Then an author out of his setting is naught. You can read all the fragments of Archilochos in a little while, but M. HAUETTE's *Archiloque* (Fontemoing) is a serious proposition of some 300 pages. But, wholly autoptical or not, CHRIST's *History of Greek Literature* is a valuable compend, so valuable that I made a summary of it for my own use, when it first appeared. Compilers, according to their own confession, 'lean heavily' on it. If in my summary I have borne down on it heavily, here and there, the world will never know it. *Sit tibi terra levis.*

I never join in the chorus of lamentations over the lost points in antique comedy. The type is the main thing. Archedemus serves my purpose in characterizing an immature commentator just as well as if I knew the date of his ἀμφιδρόμια, if he had any.

Allusions fifty years old are as dead as allusions two thousand years old. Dickens requires an annotator as much as Aristophanes. In a letter from Bismarck to his sister Malwine (SCHÖNFELD'S *Bismarck's Letters and Speeches*, p. 210, Appleton), I read, 'Meine Kinder rufen "Pietsch kommt" in der Freude dass ich einen Schönhauser Diener dieses Namens habe'. 'Erebo obscurius', as Kock exclaimed when he took St. Paul's ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι (2 Tim., 4, 6), for a comic fragment. 'Pietsch kommt' was a bit of slang out of my student days in Berlin more than fifty years ago, and the explanation must be sought in the Kladderadatsch of the period. To me the joy of the children at the living incorporation of a slang phrase is quite comprehensible. To the same epoch belongs the story of the boy with frost-bitten hands (p. 243, 26)—wrong reference in SCHÖNFELD. 'Geschieht meenen Vater schon recht. Warum kooft er mich keene Handschuhe nicht'. But a Berlin friend tells me that my dialect is wrong.¹ I wonder if Aristophanes' Laconian was any better than my Berlinese.

C. K.: For nearly a century no edition of the *Disputationes Tusculanae* has appeared in the British Islands. Mr. T. W. DOUGAN, of Queen's College, Belfast, undertakes to remedy this omission; volume I of his edition, covering Books I-II, in octavo form, costing ten shillings, appeared last summer. Mr. DOUGAN prides himself on presenting a revised text; he lays stress in his preface on the many MSS he has collated or examined, and devotes to them about 31 of the 51 pages of his introduction. It is a great pity, therefore, that he did not put together a table of the passages in which his text is, in his judgment, an improvement over Mueller's. Why should the reader be compelled to trace this point out himself, line by line? The sources of I-II are discussed on pages xx-xxvi. The editor seems to be entirely unaware of the numerous other writings with which in certain places Tusculans I has affinities. Had he surmised this and then read the Einleitung to Norden's edition of Aeneid VI he could have made solid additions to his scrappy and inadequate treatment.

Some of the grammatical notes are beneath the dignity of a book of this form: will any one who uses such an edition need two notes within the first five lines of the Latin text on the subjunctive in *cum*-causal clauses? Akin to this is the editor's habit of giving full accounts of familiar stories (e. g. in a note on II. 20 he gives in detail the story of the shirt of Nessus, etc.) instead of merely referring to a classical dictionary or to some classical account, such as Ovid's.

¹ S'is meenen Vater schon recht, wenn ick mir de Fingern verfriere; warum kooft er mer keene Handschuhe nicht?

The work of American scholars seems to be unknown to our editor. In I 3 he brackets the last clause, *qui fuit maior natu quam Plautus et Ennius*. A study of Professor Hendrickson's paper on Pre-Varronian Literary History (A. J. P. XIX 285 ff.: see especially 295) would have helped him much here. For my own part I may say that I have long felt that this clause could easily be retained. Since the ablative absolute *C. Claudio . . . Ennium* is after all a wholly subordinate phrase, a mere temporal adverb in effect, why may not *qui* refer back to *Livius*, spite of the adjacent *Ennium*? On II 20-22, Cicero's translation of Sophocles Trach. 1046-1102, there is no reference to Professor Earle's careful discussion of this passage in the Transactions of the American Philological Association, XXXIII (1902), 21-29.

I miss many things, too, in the account on pages lvi-lxii of the argument of I-II. I hope some day to see an edition of a philosophical work of Cicero in which each book shall be plotted out, so to say, and the relations of the various sections to one another shall receive entirely adequate treatment. For example, it would be worth while, even in an edition such as this aims to be, to point out that I 35 is a summing up of I 27-34. §§36-52 of this book do not receive sufficient attention, either in the commentary or in the introduction. How do they fit into the scheme of this book? Cicero's purpose is to prove that the soul is immortal: yet in 36 ff. he writes as if, fully convinced that he had demonstrated the immortality of the soul, he were at liberty to talk of the state of the soul and its abiding place after death. It would be worth an editor's while, too, to consider afresh the paragraphing and sectioning; while retaining, of course, for purposes of reference, the traditional division, he might well indicate also the results of a more rigidly logical system of analysis. Recent class-room work of this sort on the first book of the *De Officiis* has convinced me anew of its value. So, to return to the *Tusculans*, if chapter XVIII and section 41 of Book I were both made to begin with *Horum igitur aliquid*, etc., two or three lines above the point where in the traditional division XVIII begins, and if everything from *Horum igitur aliquid* through *concalescunt*, 42, were set in a single paragraph, the connection of ideas would, I think, be far more readily grasped.

The octavo form of this book, its price, the preface and the elaborate apparatus criticus excite high expectations, but these the introduction and the commentary do not fulfill. It is instructive to contrast the editor's notes with the contributions he has included from the pen of Dr. Reid; the latter are as good as everything is which Dr. Reid writes on Cicero.

D. M. R.: *Die Hellenische Kultur*, by the triumvirate FRITZ BAUMGARTEN, FRANZ POLAND and RICHARD WAGNER (Teub-

ner, Leipzig, 1905), is a book in every way to be commended. An introduction on 'Land und Leute' and on 'Sprache und Religion' is followed by an excellent account of the Mycenaean Age (part I), of the political and private and religious life of the Greeks, of Greek architecture and sculpture and painting (including vases), and of Greek literature and philosophy in the Greek Middle Ages (part II), and in the fifth and fourth centuries down to the time of Alexander the Great (part III). The work is concluded with a good index and a comparative chronological table for history, literature and art. Though written for the home as well as for the school and though entirely void of bibliography, the book is very scholarly, and has taken into account the latest investigations, archaeological and philological. For example, on the archaeological side a brief but good account is given of the excavations at Delphi with an excellent plan and reconstruction from the *Nouvelles Fouilles de Delphes*. On the philological side might be cited the excellent treatment of Bacchylides and Timotheos. Especially to be praised is the beautiful make-up of the book, printed as it is on the best paper and adorned with seven colored plates and 355 illustrations, many of which are not to be found in other handbooks. Every classical student will welcome the book because of these fine reproductions, which are taken from the best and most recent publications. But there are a few exceptions. Many vase-paintings are reproduced from Furtwängler und Reichhold, but the François vase is taken from the antiquated work of Rayet et Collignon. The frontispiece gives a colored reproduction of a corner of the pre-Peisistratean Hekatompedon from Wiegand's *Porosarchitektur*, but on p. 138 we have the old restoration of its pedimental sculptures given by Brueckner in the *Athen. Mitth.* XIV. Nor is any account taken in the text of the work of Wiegand or of Furtwängler. P. 209 the illustration of the Pnyx is taken from an inadequate drawing in Curtius' *Stadtgeschichte von Athen*, and Curtius' view that the so-called Pnyx served a religious purpose is accepted. This betrays an ignorance of Crow's paper on the Athenian Pnyx (cf. *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, vol. IV). P. 298 the head of Iris, discovered by Waldstein, is omitted from the east frieze of the Parthenon.

There are many statements which one could dispute. But attention may be limited to the following more obvious errors. P. 108, pl. II the stoa of the Athenians at Delphi, dated about 506 B. C., is said to have been built after the battle of Salamis. Pp. 272, 273 the sculptures of the Treasury of the Cnidians, which belong to the last quarter of the sixth century, are dated after the Persian wars, and are placed after the Olympia pedimental sculptures. P. 242 on the well-known Berlin cylix of Duris, representing a school scene, a flute-case is called "ein Futteral für eine Rolle mit daranhängendem Titelzettel", and

p. 243 a papyrus-roll is called a flute-case. P. 251 30,000 is given as the seating capacity of the theatre at Athens, 60,000 for the theatre at Ephesus. If these numbers were divided by two, we should have a more correct statement. P. 424 the Ionic vase of the sixth century, representing the comical scene of Heracles slaying Busiris, is classed as late-Etruscan. But for a work covering such a large field, the book is extremely accurate and deserves all praise. A high standard has been set for the second volume which will picture "Die Kultur des Hellenismus und des Römervolkes". In this day, when Jebb the philologist (Bacchylides p. 225) says with regard to the Theseus cylix (*Die Hellenische Kultur*, pl. VIII) that "Amphitrite bestows no wreath on Theseus" as in Ode XVI of Bacchylides, and when Walters the archaeologist (*History of Ancient Pottery* II p. 110) says of this same vase that "the subject cannot be placed in literary tradition", such a book as *Die Hellenische Kultur* supplies the needed link between philology and archaeology.